

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action dated October 3, 2008. All rejections and objections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Support for the present amendments may be found at various places in the application as originally filed. For example, support for the present amendments is found in lines 8-11 on page 12. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-2 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, based on the combination of United States patent number 7,216,147 of Blagsvedt, WO 01/86472 A1 of Mendiola, “Conversation Trees and Threaded Chats, 2000” of Smith, United States published patent application 2002/0165898 of Duffy, and “Wikipedia – Wiki” of Gottrop. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Blagsvedt discloses a user interface is configured to identify and display service providers servicing a user's computing system. The Blagsvedt interface also identifies the presence information that is being supplied to the service providers by the user's local computing system for publication. The Blagsvedt user can make global or discrete customized changes to the presence information that is provided to each of the service providers through the user interface, and modifications made to the presence information can also be made automatically to reflect a new condition or status in the user's presence on a network that is provided by a service provider.

Mendiola discloses a system for establishing the online status of a user, that includes assigning online status flags that are based on user activity, such as sending an instant message, receiving an instant message, or interacting with the instant messaging server system.

Smith discloses a system that displays user entries listing times that corresponding users enter and exit.

Duffy discloses a method for sharing tasks that includes identifying a covered user that is assigned one or more tasks, identifying a surrogate user that is associated with the covered user, identifying an unfinished task from the one or more tasks assigned to the covered user, creating a link for the surrogate user to the unfinished task assigned to the covered user, and providing the ability for the surrogate user to access the unfinished task via the link.

Gottrop discloses the use of “CamelCase” as a link pattern used in the past by some “wiki” Web pages.

Nowhere in the combination of Blagsvedt, Mendiola, Smith, Duffy and Gottrop is there disclosed or suggested any system or method of providing a user status message in an instant messaging system, including:

...
adding said new entry to said user status message, wherein said adding said new entry includes inserting a time at which said new entry was added into said user status message, wherein said adding said new entry to said user status message further includes adding said new entry to a plurality of previous entries maintained within said user status message, wherein said new entry and said previous entries together provide an editing history of said status message, and *wherein said new entry and each of said plurality of previous entries are each editable by both said owner user and by remote users that have registered to receive awareness information regarding said owner user by including said owner user in their respective instant messaging buddy lists*, through a clickable portion of said user status message; and
broadcasting said user status message with edits made by said owner user and edits made by said remote users to said new entry and to said plurality of previous entries from an instant messaging server process to respective instant messaging client processes of each of said remote users. (emphasis added)

as in the present independent claim 1. In contrast, the combined references disclose a system that allows the local user to edit and control their own presence information as it is sent

from their local system for publication as in Blagsvedt (e.g. column 5 line 21 through column 7 line 3, also column 8 lines 34-36), that automatically detects and time stamps activities of instant messaging system users as in Mendiola (e.g. pages 9 and 10), that provides a threaded chat user interface for chat sessions as in Smith (e.g. Fig. 1), that allows a delegated user to access and respond to received messages on behalf of an absent user as in Duffy (e.g. paragraph 0008), and that further includes using “CamelCase” as a link pattern used in one or more wiki Web pages as in Gottrop. Nothing in the combined references discloses even the need for or desirability of allowing remote users that have registered to receive awareness information regarding an owner user by including the owner user in their respective instant messaging buddy lists to edit newly entered and previously entered entries in the owner user’s status message that is broadcast with edits made by the owner user and edits made by such remote users to the new entry and to the plurality of previous entries from an instant messaging server process to respective instant messaging client processes of each of the remote users, as in the present independent claim 1. Moreover, a person skilled in the art with common sense would not modify Blagsvedt to allow others to edit the user’s presence information, since such modification would relinquish control over the user’s presence information to other users, and would therefore go counter to the fundamental purpose of Blagsvedt, which is to enable the *local user to control the exact presence information published by service providers* (see for example lines 27-3 in column 8 and lines 39-43 in column 2 of Blagsvedt), such that the local user’s presence can be represented accurately or *inaccurately* by the local user (see lines 41-43 in column 8).

In view of the foregoing, the combination of Blagsvedt, Mendiola, Smith, Duffy and Gottrop fails to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 with regard to the

present independent claim 1. As claim 2 depends from claim 1, it is respectfully believed to be patentable over Blagsvedt, Mendiola, Smith, Duffy and Gottrop for at least the same reasons.

Dependent claims 3-6 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, based on the combination of Blagsvedt, Mendiola, Smith, Duffy and Gottrop together with Pyra Labs ("Blogger"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Blogger discloses a system for creating Web pages referred to as "blogs" that are made up of chronologically arranged "posts". Like Blagsvedt, Mendiola, Smith, Duffy and Gottrop, Blogger includes no teaching or suggestion of even a need for allowing remote users that have registered to receive awareness information regarding an owner user by including the owner user in their respective instant messaging buddy lists to edit newly entered and previously entered entries in the owner user's status message that is broadcast with edits made by the owner user and edits made by such remote users to the new entry and to the plurality of previous entries from an instant messaging server process to respective instant messaging client processes of each of the remote users, as in the present independent claim 1, from which claims 3-6 depend. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Blagsvedt, Mendiola, Smith, Duffy, Gottrop, and Blogger does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claim 1, and therefore does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 with regard to independent claim 1. Dependent claims 3-6 are respectfully believed to be patentable over the combination for at least the same reasons.

Reconsideration of all remaining claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants have amended claims herein. However, Applicants are not conceding in this application that the unamended or cancelled claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating

expeditious prosecution of allowable subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the unamended and/or cancelled claims in one or more continuation and/or divisional patent applications.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

March 25, 2009
Date

/David Dagg/
David A. Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
44 Chapin Road
Newton MA, 02459
(617) 630-1131

Docket No. 260-012